#### TONY KNOWLES, GOVERNOR

1016 WEST SIXTH AVENUE, SUITE 400 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-1963 PHONE: (907) 276-6222

FAX: (907) 276-0160 (907) 276-4533

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

RECEIVED AUG 3 0 1996 FCC MAIL ROOM

ALASKA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

COCIET FILE CONVERGINAL EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

August 28, 1996

Mr. William F. Caton **Acting Secretary** Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Ex parte communications CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Mr. Caton:

This letter is to document that an exparte communication occurred in Anchorage, Alaska, on August 22, 1996, as the Alaska Public Utilities Commission (APUC) hosted discussion panels on telecommunications issues facing rural Alaska. Present for the discussion were the Commissioners and Staff of the APUC; Commissioner Chong of the Federal Communications Commission; Daniel Gonzalez, legal advisor to Commissioner Chong; and members of the public, industry, and state government. A copy of the transcript of the August 22, 1996, meeting and list of appearances is attached.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Botelho ATTORNEY GENERAL

Virginia Rusch, Assistant Attorney General

ALASKA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DOCKETEL OF BROKE

# STATE OF ALASKA

# THE ALASKA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Before Commissioners:

Sam Cotten, Chairman Tim Cook

Alyce A. Hanley Dwight D. Ornquist

Don Schröer

## PUBLIC HEARING

Z.J. Loussac Library ASSEMBLY CHAMBERS 3600 Denali Anchorage, Alaska

August 22, 1996 9:00 o'clock a.m.

12BEFORE:

SAM COTTEN, Chairman

TIM COOK

ALYCE A. HANLEY DWIGHT D. ORNQUIST

DON SCHRÖER

15

10

111

1/3

14

16AND

FCC COMMISSIONER:

MS. RACHELLE CHONG

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 277-0572/Fax 274-8982 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 272-7515

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

# APPEARANCES: Problems of Delivering Telecommunication PANEL: Services to Rural Alaska Mr. Don May, Moderator Mr. Jerry DeFrancisco, President of AT&T Alascom Mr. Steve Conn, Executive Director of Alaska Public Interest Research Group Mr: Greq Jones, Vice President for Rural Services General Communication, Inc. Mr. Lance Ahern, President of Internet Alaska. Mr. Jack Rhyner, President of TelAlaska, Inc. Mr. Red Boucher, President of Revolution Mr. John Lindback, Chief of Staff for Lieutenant Governor Fran Ulmer 10PANEL: Telemedicine and Tele-education ∥1Ms. Susan Elliott, Moderator Mr. Fred Pearce, Director of the Alaska Telemedicine Project Dr. John Monohan, Superintendent of the Fairbanks North Star Borough School District Ms. Kathe Boucha-Roberts, Project Manager for Providence Hospital Health Systems Mr. Dave Fauske, General Manager of Arctic Slope Telephone Association Mr. Gene Kaplanis, Chief Information Officer at Columbia Alaska Regional Hospital 16 17 Mr. Richard Hall, Alaska area Native Health Service #8Mr. Robert Medinger, Chairman of the Distance Delivery Consortium, Technology Assisted Instruction Media Center 19 Lower Kuskokwim School District 20 21 22 23 24 25

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	I ABUE OF CONTE	NID	
2	OPENING REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER CHONG	: 05	
3	(a) PANEL: Problems of Delivering Te Services to Rural Alaska	lecommunication	
5 6 7 8	NAME Mr. Don May Mr. DeFrancisco Mr. Conn Mr. Jones Mr. Ahern Mr. Rhyner Mr. Boucher	PAGE 10 13 22 32 42 49 54	
ĺ	10 (b) PANEL: Telemedicine and Tele-education		
1	NAME 12Ms. Susan Elliott Mr. Pearce 13Dr. Monohan Ms. Boucha-Roberts 14Mr. Fauske Mr. Kaplanis	PAGE 68 76 83 90 96 102	
1	Mr. Hall 16Mr. Medinger	105 108	
1	7CLOSING REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER CHONG	: 117	
1	18		
- 1	9		
2	o		
	1		
2	22		
2	22 23 24 25		
2	24		
2	25		

# R & R COURT REPORTERS

810 N STREET 277-0572/Fax 274-8982 1007 WEST THIRD AVENUE 272-7515

# RECEIVED AUG 3 0 1996 FCC MAIL ROOM

#### PROCEEDINGS

Tape 1

3

(On record - 9:07 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN COTTEN: Good morning. This is the Alaska
Public Utilities Commission and the purpose of our meeting
today is to enjoy the benefit of some great expertise here with
our two panels this morning. One on the problems of delivering
telecommunication services in rural Alaska and one on
totelemedicine and tele-education. We're also very fortunate to
libe joined today by Commissioner Rachelle Chong of the Federal
Communications Commission and her legal advisor, Daniel

Let me introduce the Public Utilities Commission. I'm

15Chairman Sam Cotten. Commissioner Tim Cook and not chairman

16yet. Commissioner Dwight Ornquist, Commissioner Alice Hanley

17and Commissioner Don Schröer.

Again, we're very pleased to have Commissioner Chong
19join us here today in Alaska. I asked her how she happened to
20decide to come to Alaska and she said that at the insistence of
21our senior senator we've been encouraging her for quite some
22time to visit Alaska and to gain a better appreciation of what
23takes place here as far as communications is concerned. We're
24especially happy to see you here today, too, it's visitor
25season in Alaska and most of us who live here are always happy

to have visitors because then we can enjoy the benefit of touring around Alaska and going fishing with our visitors or whatever we happen to choose to do. And similar circumstances here today, we will also enjoy the benefit of this panel that's been assembled at your request. So welcome to Alaska and please take the floor here to make whatever opening remarks you'd like to.

MS. CHONG: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First I just wanted to correct my name it's, Rachelle, in case anyone's lowondering. It's a terrific pleasure to be here in the great listate of Alaska. I assume the FCC commissioners don't get up listate for Northern Exposure very often and I'm pleased that I listate to find the time to make the trip this year.

15here learning as much as I can about the unique challenges of 16your state in receiving telecommunications service. That is 17the primary goal of my trip. As the Chairman mentioned, there 18were two reasons why I came. The first is that, indeed, the 19senior Senator, Mr. Stevens, has been, what I would call 20beating on me for about two years to come to Alaska. He told 21me that there were very unique challenges faced in your state 22due to climate and geography and topography and that I simply 23couldn't believe it unless I saw it with my own eyes. And so 24being that I'm from the state of California and I'm the only 25West Coast Commissioner on the Federal Communications

Commission, I felt a special responsibility to come out and to find out what is going on in Alaska so that I can better represent your state's interests in the decisions that I make at the FCC.

We are also in my office looking very carefully at the interests of other rural, insular or remote states, such as, the Northern Maryannis Islands, Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico. I wanted to talk for just a minute about the new Telecommunications Act of 1996, which was passed into law in 10February of this year. As you may know, the Commission has 11been working literally night and day to implement the Act. For 12the first time the Act recognizes the convergence of numerous 13types of telecommunication, such as telephone, video 14programming, data services. There is no question that the new 15act represents a very dramatic fee change in how the Commission 16regulates communications. It basically shifts us from a 17monopoly style regulation to a competitive model.

As you may know, the primary purpose of law is to 19 promote competition and reduce regulation to secure lower 20 prices and higher quality services for American 21 telecommunication consumers and to encourage the rapid 22 deployment of new telecommunications. And I would say that the 23 main thrust of the law is to introduce competition particularly 24 in the local telephone and the video programming markets. As 25 you may know right now, most American communities have only one

cable provider and one local telephone provider. And so to encourage more competition in both of these markets, the Act encourages various types of companies to enter these markets.

I wanted to just take a minute to step back and to give you my perspective on what I think the Act will do for the I think that what the new communications market in the future. law is encouraging is the building of two facilities based broadband wires into the home. One provided by the telephone d company and one provided by the cable company. And through 10these wires, a very broad variety of services will be offered. 11Services including telephone service, video programming, 12interactive services, data services, things like home shopping 13and high speed internet access. And I also wanted to add that 14in addition to the wired pipes going into the home, there will 15also be wireless pipes to the homes so that these types of 16services may also be delivered wirelessly. So I think that my 17personal vision is that in maybe three to five years, the 18average American will have multiple choices for any 19communication service that he or she wants and they would be 40ordering these services from what we currently call the 1telephone company, the cable company, the wireless company. 22And -- but they will be ordering all of these varieties of 23services from any of those providers.

Now, let's get down to specifics. I came to Alaska to 25do some fact finding in relation to the federal/state joint

board's ongoing proceeding on universal telephone service. I

am one of three FCC commissioners that are entrusted with

serving on this joint board, along with four state

commissioners and one consumer advocate representative. Now,

in addition to the pro-competitive deregulatory goals of the

Act that I was just talking about, the new law requires us to

preserve and advance universal telephone service to all

Americans. And under the Act, the federal/state joint board

has been charged with restructuring our current universal

loservice system. Congress has directed us to revamp our current

lsystem to make sure that all Americans have access to

2communication services at just, reasonable and affordable

3prices.

The new universal service system must ensure that all 15subsidies are funded in an explicit manner and not an implicit 16manner with all telecommunication carriers paying into the 17universal service fund. Under the system eligible telecomm 18carriers will receive subsidies irrespective of the technology 19that they use to provide the telephone service. In other 20words, whether or it's wired or wireless or something else, it 21won't matter. We've also been asked to ensure that rural, 22insular and high cost areas are better served by basic telecomm 23services.

And, in addition we've also been charged with promoting 25access to advanced telecommunication services. This may

include applications such as telemedicine or tele-education. So I am here to learn as much as I can about what Alaskans have done in this area and to understand the very special challenges that you face here due to geography, topography, climate and remoteness.

Finally, I just wanted to add that, I know it's not often you get a chance to have a go at an FCC commissioner in person, also I brought my very able common carrier advisor, Mr. Gonzalez, with me. We have been working very hard on loimplementation of the Act, so if you'd like to come up and ask lsome questions about the implementation of the Act, we would be lappy to make ourselves available to answer questions.

Finally, I did want to note that remarks made at this 14mornings meetings will be made part of the official record of 15the federal/state joint board proceeding on universal service, 16so you should be aware that these remarks will be included in 17the Commission's record. Thank you very much to everybody who 18has been contributing to make sure that I have an instructive 19and informative trip here to Alaska.

Thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN COTTEN: Thank you very much, Commissioner
22Rachelle Chong. And, again, thank you for coming to Alaska, we
23certainly appreciate it. Well, we can go right into our panel
24discussion at this time. The first of our distinguished and
25outstanding panels will discuss the problems of delivering

# R & <u>R COURT REPORTERS</u>

telecommunication services in rural Alaska and the moderator for this panel is Don May, who is a former utility commissioner and currently is the director of the NBA program and telecommunications management at Alaska Pacific University.

And I'd ask Don to introduce his panel and at this point you have the floor, sir.

MR. MAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, I'm

B Don May and I'm the moderator for this morning's first panel;

Problems of Delivering Telecommunication Services to Rural

10Alaska. It's a daunting title. But problems demand solutions,

11but more accurately a choice of solutions. I think today we'll

12here more about solutions and choices than we will about

13problems.

Think for a minute, if you will, about the problems of 15delivering telecommunication services to rural Alaska. Are 16they technical problems, economic problems, political problems? 17Perhaps they're a combination of all three? We do know that 18historically Alaska has been an expensive place to provide 19telecommunication services. The climate is often harsh, 20distances are vast and the population is vastly distributed. 21Commissioner Chong, if you drive a few miles outside of 22Anchorage, Alaska, this will all become very clear if you ever 23get the chance to do that.

We also note that in the past, state policy makers and, 25yes, even federal policy makers have made and enforced a strong

commitment to ensure that telecommunication services are available to all Alaskans. For example, in the very early days of long distance service in Alaska, after our system was privatized in 1970, before that, remember it had been owned by the U.S. Government. Now, the state requires that all communities of 25 persons or more be provided modern long distance telecommunication service. This was an ambitious goal in the state with many communities that are fewer than 200 people, most of which are not connected by roads. This orequired building a satellite based system with earth stations lin'villages in rural Alaska now common place. While technology 2 has changed and will continue to change, the satellite model of 3 delivery of long distance services is still the dominate model 14 in rural Alaska.

So much for the past, what about the future? The 16Telecommunications Act of 1996 has stood the world on its head, 17both the old players in the market and the new entrants in the 18market have new visions and new dreams of what 19telecommunication service is, how it can be provided and what 20role it should play in shaping the good society in the digital 21age. Even more important for us, how does it apply to our 22state, Alaska?

Today's panel will discuss those topics. I'll 24introduce the panelists very briefly. Starting at my immediate 25left is Mr. Jerry DeFrancisco, President of AT&T Alascom.

Proceeding to the left, Steve Conn, Executive Director of
Alaska Public Interest Research Group. To his left, Greg
Jones, Vice President for Rural Services General Communication,
Inc. To his left, Lance Ahern, President of Internet Alaska.
Moving past our Court Reporter, Suzie, to her left is Jack
Rhyner, President of TelAlaska, Inc. To his left is Red
Boucher, President of Revolution. And our last panelist is
John Lindback, Chief of Staff for Lieutenant Governor, Fran
Ulmer.

10 The way today's panel will work, I've asked each #Ipanelist to limit their remarks to 10 minutes, it's a large 12panel and our time is limited. I will be enforcing the 10 \$\frac{1}{3}\text{minutes and the young lady in the front row for the panelist is 14also my assistant timekeeper. Raise your hand, Christina. 15she'll also be helping me if I forget. After the 10 minute 16presentations or not to exceed 10 minutes, there will be time 17for questions. We've allocated five minutes, it's fairly The first questions will go to Commissioner Chong, our 19out of state guest, after that if there's time, we'll have 20questions from APUC commissioners. I may have to limit you \$\frac{1}{2}\text{lcommissioners, depending on your own discretion. My one chance 22to -- the tables are turned for once and I know you all have 23many questions.

With no further ado, let me introduce Jerry

25DeFrancisco. Jerry's fairly new to Alaska, been here about a

1 year, a little over a year. But he's not new to telephone,
2 he's been with AT&T for 24 years in a number of assignments
3 throughout the U.S. When AT&T acquired Alascom and became AT&T
4 Alascom, he came up here to become the president, Mr.
5 DeFrancisco.

MR. DEFRANCISCO: Thank you, Don. It's a pleasure to be here this morning to talk about a subject that's very important to me as well as all the women and men of AT&T Alascom. When I think about the challenges of delivering 10service in rural areas, what normally comes to mind is 11distance, weather, geography and what kind of technological and 12challenges that presents. But I think the technological 13challenges are small and very solvable compared to the economic 14and regulatory challenges.

As I've traveled through Alaska in the last year and I 16am new to Alaska, I don't pretend to be an expert, but I've 17kind of had a crash course in the last year. We asked a group 18of people to come together to be a rural and Native advisory 19board for us from areas all throughout Alaska and one of the 20first things they challenged me to do is, if you're really 21interested you have to come out and see rural Alaska. So I've 22traveled extensively in the last year or year and a half. I've 23been to many different places, talked to the people that we 24serve in those places, all the way from municipal government, 25state government, hospitals, clinic, school administrators and

school children and people that use our service throughout

Alaska. And when I think of the challenges, it's very easy to

come up with technical solutions for what people want.

The difficulty is the economic and the regulatory
hurdles to get there. Because we're sparsely populated and
scattered throughout the state, it's difficult to get a
critical mass that makes investment economically feasible. We
have made some investments. One of the first things we did was
to evaluate the network have and decided right away, it was not
loa difficult decision to spend 35 million dollars to upgrade the
learth stations in the rural villages because the level of
leservice that was currently being provided didn't provide any
lakind of a platform to move forward.

We've also spent about 10 million dollars in Southeast
15Alaska to complete a route through there that's totally
16digital. We're replacing some radio equipment that went in in
17the late '60s. The idea was, unless we created that basic
18platform we weren't even ready to begin talking about what kind
19of other services could be provided. However, having done that
20the next step is, what does everyone want, what is the level of
21service people are asking for? And again, the technical
22challenges are not that large. We understand how to do it and
23I've gotten past in my career ever saying, that problem X is
24technology unsolvable, because normally within three months the
25right minds get on it and it gets solved. So that's not the

question. The question is, economically how do we serve people in a rural population that is diverse and scattered throughout a wide geographic area with the barriers of geography and weather that we're also familiar with?

I think the good news is the Communications Act of 1996 sets the stages for the changes that we need to make. I think we're just beginning to realize the impact of that Act and how far reaching it's going to be into all of our lives. It's a fundamental shift in the regulatory process, a sea level change 10unlike anything I think we've seen before. And in Alaska, I 11know the APUC has worked hard to develop a competitive market 12that will enable competition to flourish, new services to come 13in and prices to come down. And I think this Act, again, sets 14a whole new level of study for us and action really, an agenda 15that says, what do we do to take advantage of this and what are 16the changes that are going to result because of what's 17happening.

In order to get the benefits of competition, we need to 19make sure that people want to invest the right kind of dollars 20and effort into rural Alaska to bring those kind of services.

21And the current subsidy mechanism, that's where universal 22services recovered through access is not going to allow that to 23happen. It's hidden -- it's a hidden tax, we're all paying it, 24we just don't see it in front of us. So we are very encouraged 25by the initial steps of the Communications Act and the ongoing

activities that have mandated that subsidies of this type are necessary but they need to be explicit, they need to be fairly distributed and paid by everyone.

As I said, we're paying it now, so let's call it what it is, lay it out on the table and decide what we do about it.

And part of that is determining a rational level of what is the cost of providing local service. From an AT&T standpoint we fully agree that universal service needs to be delivered. We need it to make service affordable to everyone, including those lowho don't have the means to pay for basic telephone service as liwell as for people who are located in isolated areas where the located of providing service is above the average. But our laposition is that that subsidy needs to be provided in an latexplicit form as a surcharge on everyone providing retail latelecommunication services so that it is spread out and we know lewhat it is.

And that's our fundamental position and we believe if

18that happens we'll understand better what it takes to provide

19service economically and I think will encourage investment.

20And people will be prompted to develop new services and find

21creative ways to deliver them. But no matter how good the

22technology is, if the economic platform is missing and the

23economic payback is not there, then I don't think we're going

24to proceed to where we need to be.

I've learned a lot about Alaska in the last year. I've

#### R & R COURT REPORTERS

25

learned a lot about what it takes to live in rural Alaska, even though I've never lived there myself. And I've been continually impressed by the ingenuity of people and the things that they have developed on their own in order to have a quality of life in those areas. And I think that one of the great things about being in this industry aside from being in an industry that's exploding with all kinds of technological opportunities, it is a real opportunity to do something that benefits people aside from being in a business like any other lobusiness. I'm seeing that the benefits of delivering services lito rural areas, seeing students in remote areas having access leave the cities that they've grown up in.

In places where it's happened, it's been demonstrated

15that graduation rates improve. I was on St. Paul Island

16recently and talking to the school commissioner there who

17talked about establishing a high school on St. Paul Island has

18like tripled the graduation rate for residents of St. Paul

19Island because students don't have to face leaving their

20families and going somewhere else.

Again, delivering the level of service we have there 22today costs money. To deliver what we want to do is going to 23cost more money and the question is, what's the trade-off 24between our ability to provide that service and ability to have 25it paid for. I think competition can exist in rural Alaska. I

think it can exist there as it can anywhere else, but we also recognize the unique needs of the local exchange companies in those areas and we believe that the modification of the universal service fund will enable those rural companies, provided they're run like any other company, to survive and prosper. But we need to take out this hidden subsidy, this hidden tax and lay it on the table and understand what it is we're trying to do.

So that's the basic message that I have this morning.

10Again, I didn't want to bore you with the challenges of serving

11all areas in Alaska because I think you know that. You've

12heard the stories about helicopters servicing sites and

13refueling generators on mountain tops, that's all a given if

14you want to do business in Alaska. We did not shrink from that

15when AT&T came to Alaska because that's part of doing business

16in Alaska and if we didn't want to do that, we wouldn't have

The real question, as I said, is the economic hurdle 19 and the regulatory hurdle and we're very encouraged by what's 20 happening with the Communication Act and very confident that 21 given the right determination of basic levels of service and 22 the right subsidy to make sure everyone has access to those 23 services, that those services will be delivered and that will 24 deliver benefits to society as well as being able to have 25 healthy businesses here in Alaska.

Thank you.

MR. MAY: Thank you, Mr. DeFrancisco. Questions from Commissioner Chong?

MS. CHONG: Yes. Mr. DeFRancisco, you were talking

about, we need to identify the right core services for

universal service. In the Commissions notice we had suggested

five core services, voice grade access, touchtone, single party

service, access to emergency services and access to operator

services. Do you think that list of five core services is

loappropriate for the rural communities that you're speaking of

llor would you add something to that list?

MR. DEFRANCISCO: I believe it's the starting point.

13think that there is demand for other services. We are still

14not certain as to what the level of those services are and how

15pervasive the demand is for those services. We know that the

16schools would like internet service, for example. I don't -
17I'm not ready to say that that should be part of a universal

18service at this point.

Again, the big question in my mind, Commissioner, is 20economically how do we provide first that basic level of 21services that you mentioned and the next step, if we want to 22raise the level and provide more services, what is that going 23to do to the economic model and what's going to happen from 24there.

MS. CHONG: Now, we've been talking about various cost

#### <u>R & R COURT REPORTERS</u>

25

models to determine what kind of support would be paid to the carriers providing universal service. I don't know how familiar you are with it, but we've been looking at some proxy models that might allow us to give reasonable estimates and reimburse the carriers that are doing universal service. Does AT&T Alascom have any opinions about the proxy models and whether that might be the way to go as opposed to going with, for example, historical costs or a competitive bidding type of procedure?

10 MR. DEFRANCISCO: We believe that the right model is
11the one being discussed and that's total service long range
12incremental costs, so called TSLRIC. The difficulty with
13historic cost is in some cases those historic costs may
14represent obsolete or redundant or unnecessary facilities. So
15we need to look forward to understand what it's going to take
16to provide service and like any business if we've invested
17something and that investment turns out to be obsolete or turns
18out to be unnecessary, then we can't turn to our customers and
19say you need to make that up because we've made a mistake. So
20we believe in the TSLRIC economic model and we think that will
21fit for the majority of the country.

MS. CHONG: We've been looking at some proxy models,

23but I note that they do not include Alaska in it. And so I

24just wanted to suggest to the parties that are here that if we

25are to use mechanisms like a proxy model, for example, what

would be appropriate especially when the ones that we're
looking at right now only deal with the 48 continental states
and not states like Alaska and Hawaii, for example.

MR. DEFRANCISCO: Well, I believe that we should still use the model for the Lower 48 and then any difference between providing cost in the -- all but one local exchange company in Alaska, qualify under the rural exemption of the Act. So if we use the TSLRIC model for costing, say that's the average cost of providing local service, then the new universal service fund locould make up the difference in the case of a rural exchange lisuch as in Alaska whose costs are higher. And the difference leavould be again, coming through an explicit subsidy to make up the difference between the average cost and the actual cost 14here.

MS. CHONG: Now, suppose we get the amount of support 16right, do you think that this will be enough to encourage your 17company to make that economic trade-off and put those 18facilities in in these remote communities?

MR. DEFRANCISCO: Well, I think the -- I think it will 20 provided we expand the universal service fund in areas where we 21 have average cost and average prices such as in Alaska. It 22 costs the same for a basic length of telephone call from urban 23 to urban area as it does in a rural area. If we're going to 24 have averaged rates, then there needs to be for the inter-25 exchange company also an incentive to provide service and that

1 could be made up also by a universal service subsidy that 2 compensates that carrier for providing that service and making I the investment into a rural area. Because today we are faced with a dual model between the rural areas and the urban areas and different levels of cost. And as long as we want to have d average pricing, I think again, some type of a subsidy 7 mechanism for the difference between providing those services 8 would be what would really prompt long distance companies to want to provide services into rural areas. 10 Thank you. That's the end of my questions. MS. CHONG: MR. MAY: Thank you. Chairman Cotten or APUC 12Commissioners? CHAIRMAN COTTEN: Mr. May, I think we'll pass on this 14one. I think we'll have opportunities to ask Mr. DeFrancisco 15questions. 16 MR. MAY: Thank you. Our second speaker is Steve Conn, 17Executive Director of the Alaska Public Interest Research **1**∥8Group. Mr. Conn is a former professor of justice at the 19University of Alaska and has published extensively on problems 20of rural minorities and cultural minorities in Alaska and 21elsewhere in the world. Mr. Conn has traveled extensively in 22Alaska including the Alaska, what he refers to as the old days, 23Steve. 24 Thanks very much, Don, and thank you very MR. CONN: 25much for the opportunity to participate in the panel. As Don

indicated, for more than 20 years I've looked very closely and, in fact, was attracted to Alaska by the challenge of the delivery of justice services or law services to the 200 plus Alaska Native villages throughout the Alaska landscape. And in that vein my first present to you, Commissioner Chong, will be something that is uniquely missing in this public room, a map of Alaska that has the Alaska Native villages on it. Because I was impressed by the fact that the map being used by the FCC in developing proxy models is somewhat akin to maps in the 19th locentury in the sense that it absolutely has blank spaces in it lunsurveyed, unknown, terra incognito.

Well, the state is fairly well known and fairly well 12 The challenge of universal service in this state, 13developed. 14if it is to meet the terms of the act is going to be profound, 15because the subject of access has to do not only with the issue 16of cost but as that issue with fundamentally laying down a 1/7technological infrastructure that will meet the needs, both #8present and aspired to by the 200 plus Alaska Native villages 19in which are Athabascan people, Yupik Eskimos, Inupiat, 20Tlingit, Haida, Shim-Shim, Siberian Eskimo and Aleut 21populations all characterized as American Indians, but none of 22-- but all of whom live in -- with the exception of Metalakatla 23live in non-reservation context. Villages that range in 24population from extremely tiny to several thousand and most of 45whom are organized already in terms of delivery of services

around regional service centers. That's a very important point here.

The Act suggests that consumers in the subject of rural and high cost, the Act states consumers in all regions of the nation, including low income, consumers, and in rural insulate or high cost areas should have access to telecommunication information services, including interchange services in advanced telecommunication information services that are reasonably comparable to the services provided in urban areas.

10And that are available and at reasonably comparable rates 11charged for similar services.

We've had the pleasure of having Assistant Commerce

13Secretary, Larry Irving, here. We've read his report on the

14technological have's and have not's. We've also had a chance

15to review the Rand Corporation study which is advocating

16universal access to E-Mail. In other words, the planners are

17now proposing that universal service in the '90s and in the

18next century do precisely what universal service did in the

19'30s for rural America. That is, bring into -- bring into play

20the talents and opportunities, hopes and dreams of the people

21in rural Alaska. We have fought vigorously, even as the Act

22was being drafted, about -- and I mean not only consumer reps,

3but service providers, as to how this could be. And I have for

4you a report, which I dare say the Lieutenant Governor's

25representative will provide you as well, Alaska 2001. We've